



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/497,493	02/04/2000	Mark Lucente	10244-004	7556

20582 7590 08/27/2002

PENNIE & EDMONDS LLP
1667 K STREET NW
SUITE 1000
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

DORVIL, RICHEMOND

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2654	

DATE MAILED: 08/27/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	g
	09/497,493	LUCENTE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Richemond Dorvil	2654	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>4.5</u> .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required when the application is allowed.

Double Patenting

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 1-22 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-12 of U.S. Patent No. 6,430,531. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because removing inherent and/or unnecessary limitations/step and rearranging the claims would be within the level of one of ordinary skill in the art. It is well settled that the omission of an element, e.g. "a system state controller ...", and its function is an obvious expedient if the remaining elements perform the same function as before. *In re Karlson*, 136 USPQ 184 (CCPA 1963). Also note Ex parte Rainu, 168 USPQ 375 (Bd. App. 1969). Omission of a reference element or step whose function is not needed would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hemphill et al., “Speech Aware Multimedia”.

As per claims 1, 11 and 22, Hemphill et al. discloses a method comprising:
receiving a first statement in a natural language from a user, (see page 77, left column, last paragraph, “How’s the whether look today?”)
generating first information based on a first statement, (see page 77, Fig. 3, Table 1, step 1 and right column, 5th full paragraph “... the user utters ‘How’s the weather look today?’”);
optionally generating a question to be presented to the user in the natural language based on the context information, (see page 77, Fig. 3, “Speak the city_name ...” and page 76, right column, “SAM ... could detect the ambiguity and offer a choice to the user ...”);
receiving a second statement in the natural language from the user, (see , (see page 77, Table 1 step 4 and left column, 1st full paragraph, “the user decides to utter “Chicago””);
generating second information based on a second statement and the information, (see page 77, Table 1 step 4 and left column, 1st full paragraph, “the user decides to utter “Chicago””; Table step 6).

As per claim 2, Hemphill et al. disclose a method comprising:

incorporating content information generated based on the second information into output to a user, (see Table step 6).

As per claim 3, Hemphill et al. disclose a method comprising:

dynamically generating the web page based on the content information, (see page 77, right column).

querying a database using the first query to thereby generate the first information, (see page 77, right column).

As per claims 4-5, Hemphill et al. disclose a method comprising;

generating grammatical data for the first statement, see page 77, right column, “the browser observes the grammar link and ask the web for the grammar …”);

generating one or more parsing tokens based on the grammatical data, (see page 77, right column, first full paragraph);

storing the parsing tokens as part of the context information, (see page 77, right column, first full paragraph).

As per claims 6-8, Hemphill et al. disclose a method comprising:

Identifying linguistic structures in the second statement based on the context information, (see page 77, table 1, step 5)

As per claim 9, Hemphill et al. disclose a method comprising:

storing and updating the context information each time a new statement in the natural language is received, (see page 75, section “speakable links”).

As per claim 10, Hemphill et al. disclose a method comprising providing at least one of a superlative and a comparison of the first information based on the context information, wherein

the first information include a plurality of items that can be compared with each other, (see page 75, section "speakable links").

As per claims 12-21, claims 12-21 are similar in scope and content to claims 2-10 rejected above, therefore claims 2-10 are rejected under the same rationale, (see page 77, Table 1).

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See PTO-892.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Richemond Dorvil whose telephone number is (703) 305-9645. The examiner can normally be reached on T-F 9:30 to 8:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Korzuch can be reached on 703 308-4825. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-9508 for regular communications and (703) 308-9051 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.



Richemond Dorvil
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2641